

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

RONALD PEARSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC HOLDER, *et. al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 3:09-CV-00682-O

ORDER

Before the Court are Plaintiff's Verified Motion for Extension of Time in Which to Comply with Scheduling Order (ECF No. 47) and Verified Motion for Extension of Time in Which to File Response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Complaint (ECF No. 48).

In his request for an extension of time to comply with the Court's Scheduling Order, Plaintiff states that the additional time is needed because he has not been able to communicate with the defendant regarding the Joint Status Report, is dependent on writ room inmates for assistance with joinder or amendment of pleadings, and must contact potential experts by mail. As is stated in the Scheduling Order (ECF No. 39), "[i]n a case with an inmate proceeding *pro se*, the parties may file separate status reports." Plaintiff has already found time to amend his pleadings and has until June to contact experts. Therefore, the Court finds that his motion for extension of time to comply with the scheduling order should be and is hereby **DENIED**. Because the deadline for the Status Report is already passed, Plaintiff has until **Friday, March 7, 2011** to comply with the Court's Order.

Plaintiff also requests additional time to respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. Several motions to dismiss have been filed, and it is not clear which motion Defendant refers to. Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff would have until February 28 to respond to Lupe

Valdez's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint (ECF NO. 41), March 1 to respond to Mitch Bates Third Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 42), and March 8, to respond to the Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 43) filed by all of the Defendants in the case. Because Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the Court will **GRANT** an extension for him to file a response to these motions. Accordingly, Plaintiff has until **March 23, 2011** to respond to the three motions to dismiss currently filed in the case.

SO ORDERED on this **1st** day of **March, 2011**.


Reed O'Connor
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE